

Stephen Kinzer – “Regime Change: Roots of the Imperial Temptation”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM> (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM>)

Uploaded by [The Future of Freedom Foundation](#)

(<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCqOG4zIDmbIUk12FzWG5tLA>) on Sat Jul 15 2017.

The Future of Freedom Foundation is pleased to announce one of the most fascinating, important, and relevant conferences in our 27-year history.

Entitled “The National Security State and JFK,” the conference was held on Saturday, June 3, 2017, at the Dulles Airport Marriott in Northern Virginia.

Stephen Kinzer is a former New York Times reporter and is currently a world affair columnist for the Boston Globe. Having taught at both Northwestern University and Boston University, he also currently a senior fellow in international and public affairs at the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs at Brown University.

A longtime critic of America's interventionist foreign policy, Kinzer's books include Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala; All the Shah's Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror; Overthrow: America's Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq; The Brothers: John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles and Their Secret World War; and, most recently, The True Flag: Theodore Roosevelt, Mark Twain, and the Birth of American Empire.

00:00:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM>)

you our next speaker Stephen Kinzer is a former New York Times reporter and is currently a world affairs columnist for the Boston Globe having taught at both Northwestern University in Boston University he is also currently a senior fellow in international and public affairs at the Watson Institute for International and public affairs at Brown University a longtime critic of America's interventionist foreign policy kyndra's books include bitter fruit the story of the American coup in Guatemala all the Shahs men an American coup and the roots of Middle East terror overthrow America century of regime change from Hawaii to Iraq the brothers John Foster Dulles Allen Dulles and their secret world war and most recently the true flag Theodore Roosevelt Mark Twain and the birth of American Empire all of which I have read in all of which I cannot recommend too highly there are absolutely fantastic books on America's history of foreign interventionism the title of Stephens talk is regime change roots of the Imperial temptation please welcome Stephen Kinzer [Applause] thank you it's wonderful to be here and especially to be following two such eminent scholars you've now been given by the last two speakers a picture of where we were around the period of the early 1960s and the Kennedy assassination so I've been asked to give something like a prequel to those

00:02:00 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=120s>)

something like a prequel to those speeches how did we get here I've been told by my publishers that journalists memoirs never sell the only people that ever buy them are other journalists therefore despite my efforts I've been told by several publishers you're never going to sell a memoir forget it so I've dropped out the idea of ever writing a memoir but I do have a title my other books usually work the other way I get the book done and then come up with a title now I have a title for which there never will be a book but it does encapsulate my approach to trying to understand America and the world it's a line from one of those old

movies that I love to watch called Arsenic and Old Lace remember that movie with Cary Grant so for those of you that forgot that one Cary Grant plays a young man who goes to visit his elderly aunt and they run a rooming house in which they poisoned the guests that's that's the theme of this comedy and there's a wonderful spot in the movie where Cary Grant turns to one of his own to try to understand what's happening beyond says oh that gentleman died because he drank wine that had poison in it and Cary Grant's eyes pop open and he says but how did the poison get in the wine that's going to be the title of my non-existent memoir that's all I ask myself so the wine of world peace and dust core and and social peace in the United States has been poisoned how did the poison get in the one essentially I've devoted my career to trying to answer that question the answers are not to be found just in the last few years and I want to try to take us back to the beginnings and a little

[00:04:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=240s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=240s)

us back to the beginnings and a little bit of the story of how we got to this point that has been so aptly described particularly in that last speech we sometimes look for the roots of America's reckless intervention in the world in the period after World War two I think that's a mistake that's too late it actually began before that you can look at the period of American imperial expansion essentially in three sections first we created a current and mental empire inside North America second in the period around the end of the 19th century we moved towards creating an overseas Empire and then the final phase came after World War two when we moved to the idea of creating global Empire but our first great debate over whether this was a good idea took place in the wake of the spanish-american war this was a huge debate that involved the entire United States and this is something that was new to me as I began my research from my most recent book I always understood that it was the period of the spanish-american war that led us into the period of imperial expansion it was that moment when we decided North America is not enough for us we need to project our coercive and military power further than that and that was the period when of course we took the Philippines into Guam and Puerto Rico and assumed responsibility for Cuba and began setting out on the path that has led us to where we are now I had always understood however that we made this decision more or less automatically that it was just the logical next step we got to California and then the next step was Hawaii in the Philippines it was a sort of a reasonable progression in which the American people

[00:06:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=362s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=362s)

progression in which the American people were complicit but actually the opposite is true the United States erupted in a nationwide debate over whether this was a good idea in the summer of 1898 there was a great explosion of anti imperialist sentiment in the United States a war that began with the purpose of liberating cue of us turned during that summer into something very different suddenly after having sunk the Spanish fleet in the Philippines we began to think maybe we should take the Philippines we should take a ye we should replace Spain we should join other European nations in the scramble for territory and influence around the world this created an eruption of protest and during that year 1898 and through in 1899 this was the subject that riveted the American people I can tell you from many hours cranking microfilms in the New York Public Library darkroom that this was on the front pages of every newspaper every day every major American political and intellectual leader took sides in this debate in the autumn of 1898 President McKinley decided that he would impose on Spain a treaty by which we would take the Philippines and other Spanish possessions and embark on our Imperial project at this point anti imperialist sentiment became intense an organization called the anti-imperialist league emerged it had chapters all around the United States it staged hundreds of public meetings distributed hundreds of thousands of leaflets and broadsides Wolk lobbied intensively in Washington it's a piece of our history that we've forgotten because I think it's something that maybe we're not told is a good

[00:08:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=481s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=481s)

that maybe we're not told is a good thing for us to remember but when you go back and read as I have the speeches that were made at that time you can't help but be struck with how prescient the anti-imperialists were in those days let me just give you an example or two the very first anti-imperialist meeting in American history was held on June 15 1898 X annual Hall in Boston it was exactly on this theme I mentioned shall we now use the Cuban War as an excuse to become an imperial power that speech was all that rally was opened by a speech by Reverend Charles Eames a leading Unitarian theologian of that era ask yourself how true this came the policy of imperialism threatens to change the temper of our people and to put us into a permanent attitude of arrogance testiness and defiance to what other nations once we enter the field of international conflict is a great military and naval power we shall be one more bully among bullies we shall only add one more to the list of oppressors of mankind that was 1898 now that autumn President McKinley decided that he would proceed with the project of annexation and world power he'd instructed his negotiators in Europe to impose this treaty on Spain and that treaty had to be ratified by the US Senate this set off a thirty two day debate in the Senate over whether this was the right thing to do or not other than the time when the founding fathers gathered to write our constitution there has never been a debate in our history when so many gifted figures came together to debate

[00:10:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=600s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=600s)

gifted figures came together to debate so profoundly an issue so heavily fraught with meaning for the entire world some ways I envy those senators and those Americans who lived in because they had this great debate is projecting our military and coercive power around the world a good thing or is it a bad thing will it help us will it help or will it undermine peace this is a debate that we don't have anymore that's why I envy them we debate is 3000 troops the right number for our surge in Afghanistan over 6000 a better number we never debate the larger questions and here was the last time the United States did that I must say that going through the debates the text of that 32 day debate is is quite humbling every issue on the question of intervention that we now discuss was first discussed then so all of American foreign policy can effectively be reduced down to one question or down to one word really it's intervention where do we intervene when under what circumstances with what tools with what gold and that hasn't changed over a period of more than a hundred years so the arguments that we use on both sides when we debate it as a nation whether to intervene in Vietnam Central America Iraq Syria are the very same ones that were used in this debate in the early months of 1899 in the US Senate yeah the one depressing thing about that debate is that the Senators then were so much more articulate even the bad guys were brilliant their speeches are masterpieces of classical oratory laced with references to Pliny

[00:12:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=721s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=721s)

oratory laced with references to Pliny the Elder the Kathleen conspiracy things you would never dream of discussing with the US senator today that we that debate is so full of meaning I want to suggest that somehow maybe the Friends of freedom would like to publish it as a as a pamphlet so that Americans can see how these debates were so brilliantly argued at that time I'm not going to go into this in great depth but let me just give you one quick exchange between the two Republican senators from Massachusetts Henry Cabot Lodge who was the great Methodists awfully the imperial project back then and his opposite number George frisbee who was a outspoken anti imperialist and both of these arguments are arguments you still hear today here's Henry Cabot Lodge I do not believe that this nation was raised up for nothing I have faith that it has a great mission in the world a mission of good a mission of freedom I believe it can live up to that mission therefore I want to see it step forward boldly and take its place at the head of Nations this lead senator George frisbee to leap to his feet and reply you have no right at the cannons mouth to impose on an unwilling people your declaration of independence and your Constitution and your notions of freedom and what is good this debate riveted America foreign diplomats based in Washington we're sending back reports every day about how it was going because all understood that this debate was not only going to shape the United States it was going to shape the future of the entire world newspapers were filled with tallies from day to day how many

[00:14:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=841s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=841s)

tallies from day to day how many senators on this side and that side which senator has been offered a federal judgeship in order to vote for the treaty which by the way he did get another senator got something even better than a federal judgeship if you're a senator which is the right to name all the postmasters in your home state nothing better than that if you're a senator so the debate went on as I said for 32 intense days and the final result was that the u.s. decided to ratify this treaty meaning not only as everyone in the Senate realized that we were going to take the Philippines but that we were going to set off on a new national path the margin was one vote more than the required two-thirds majority for that treaty one vote the anti-imperialist then appeal to the US Supreme Court they argued first of all that the US government has no powers other than those specifically granted in the Constitution and the Constitution nowhere says that the US government has the right to send troops to foreign countries they also argued that it was not legal for the u.s. to govern people anywhere in the world without giving them constitutional rights which would of course have meant the instant end of the Imperial project the Supreme Court ruled that this imperial project was legal and constitutional by a vote of five to four one vote and interestingly enough the Justice who wrote the majority decision had recently participated in the majority decision on the Plessy versus Ferguson case which of course ruled that not all Americans deserve the same amount of rights and therefore if you believe that it's logical to believe that we don't have to give rights to people in other countries either so the anti-imperialists were defeated

[00:16:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=960s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=960s)

so the anti-imperialists were defeated for a time I think they did slow down the project don't forget that in those days we annexed countries we didn't just govern them and rule them we took them over we stopped doing that the Philippine war was a huge shock I think to many Americans including Theodore Roosevelt who had strongly promoted it we truly believed as our leaders told us that we were going to be welcomed we were going to have flowers thrown at us to use the modern term as we arrived in the Philippines things didn't work out that way we left over 200,000 Filipinos dead we our first big torture scandal it was the real loss of innocence for Americans even those that wanted to ignore what we had done in the Mexican War and what we've done in our wars against Native Americans one of the things I realized from writing this book was a great discovery for me the big discovery of my new book is that this debate ever happened but I learned some other things when writing it and one has to do with Mark Twain so I grew up with what I now realizes a very partial view of Mark Twain mr. nice guy everybody loved him he sat on his front porch she rocked he had dice white curls and told funny jokes just like your beloved grandfather this was not the complete Mark Twain let me tell you Mark Twain was a vital buret of anti-imperialist many of the quotes and that I use from Mark Twain and my book don't appear in anthologies or biographies of Mark Twain like many people I think he's been bleached for our public consumption we've taken away the edge Mark Twain wrote that American soldiers fighting in Foreign Wars we're carrying a polluted musket under a bandit flag and he even wanted to change the flag of the United States to replace the Stars with skull and crossbones symbols I have to tell

[00:18:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1081s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1081s)

and crossbones symbols I have to tell you in the context of today when we're looking back to see how people understood exactly what was going to happen I have to read you this one little piece from Mark Twain which probably you haven't read since it doesn't appear in many places after the Americans did through the Senate vote decide to pursue the career of international course of power Mark Twain was horrified Mark Twain had travelled the world he had seen the faces of European imperialism in India and in South Africa he was once invited to be a Toastmaster at a dinner for our Winston Churchill and after all the other speakers the other Toastmasters too spoke about the great friendship between the US and Britain Twain got up and said that he knew what America had done in the Philippines and he'd seen what the British did in South Africa so he wanted to toast to British Britain in the United States as truly kin in sin here is a little script a scrap that Mark Twain wrote in his depression over the u.s. decision to take this Imperial course in the world ask yourself if this didn't come true or could it be written today it was impossible to save the great republic she was rotten to

the core lust of conquest had long ago done its work trampling upon the helpless abroad had taught her by natural process to endure with empathy the like at home the government was irrevocably in the hands of the prodigiously rich and their hangers-on the suffrage was become a mere machine which they used as they chose there was no principle but commercialism no patriotism but of the pocket 1899 now

[00:20:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1201s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1201s)

the course of the debate in American history between intervention and non intervention between a policy of prudent restraint and a policy of more aggressive intervention has been fascinating to follow we've never really resolved this debate in fact sometimes I think Americans are not so hard at imperialists we got into this business almost by accident we never were really sure we liked it it's not like the British and the French and the Spanish who sat down and decided we're going to have a world empire here's how we're going to start we didn't do it that way and we're still conflicted I used to feel that a good analogy for American the history of American intervention in the world would be something like let's say a tide that comes in and goes out that some days we get very excited about the supposed we've suffered in the world and we want to go out and strike down the evildoers then the costs of intervention become clear the sorrows of empire emerged the body bags come back and we could enter into a period of more calm we don't intervene so much until the cycle starts again or you could use the analogy of a pendulum it swings sometimes we're more this way sometimes are more that way but actually the more I reflect on it the more I think that those analogies are inexact in fact we don't swing back and forth between wanting to intervene and not wanting to intervene we want to do both we hold opposite opinions in our as Americans I think Americans really do want every country to guide itself but we also want to guide the world you can't believe both of those things because they're opposites but we do forced to make a choice we choose both and that's the source of the uncertain policy the United States follows in the world in the period after that first burst of imperialism at the end of the

[00:22:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1321s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1321s)

burst of imperialism at the end of the 19th century United States entered into a remarkable period of calm in world affairs even Teddy Roosevelt who was probably the greatest nation grabber in American history moved on to other issues when he became president after that first intervention when he seized land for the Panama Canal he never ordered another intervention which a single life was lost he began to understand having promoted the Philippine intervention and seeing the results that it would be better for him to spend his time on other things he moved on to protecting the environment and confronting big business the Republican presidents who followed act particularly in the teens and 20s were remarkably non interventionist the greatest uh anti imperialist president the United States ever had was Herbert Hoover Hoover takes a bad rap in history because of his response to the depression but he was a true humanitarian Hoover had lived in about a dozen different countries and saw the world very much from the perspective of non Americans so that was a moment when the United States began withdrawing troops from Foreign Wars I counted at least six countries where American companies came to present the white house and told them they've got a problem with the government in that country and with the US government please intervene and President Hoover said no it will never be the job of the US government to intervene in a dispute between an American company and some foreign government imagine a president saying that today this of course was all based on the experience of World War one I think this is another interventions it's right for re-examination World War one is truly the founding tragedy of our age without World War one there's no Nazis no Hitler no Holocaust no communist revolution in

[00:24:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1441s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1441s)

no Holocaust no communist revolution in Russia no Bolshevism had the United States not intervened in World War one the war probably would have dragged on for a couple of more years and the European powers would have come up with some settlement in which some would have gotten some things and some would have gotten some other things instead our intervention made sure that one side achieved total victory and the other side suffered total defeat and that led to the unraveling of the world to the point that we're

seeing it today now this same process began again in the 1930s as World War two was shaking Europe having been pulled into one European war we were vulnerable to being pulled into another one the United States emerged from World War two tremendously self-satisfied the flood of books magazine articles video games our movies about World War two its unending you couldn't feel it you'd have more than enough books to fill this room with just the production of one year why is that well was World War two a hugely important episode of course did it shape the modern world yes but I think there's another reason we focus so much on World War two World War two shows the United States the way we like to think we are it shows that we went into countries where there was evil dictatorship we were through we left democracy we love this story we can't get enough of it many other stories come out the other way we simply ignore those stories we pretend that they never happened those were some of the stories that begin unfolding in the 1950s now as I said it was the period after World War two when the United States decided to take its overseas Empire global

[00:26:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1561s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1561s)

overseas Empire global and I think there were a couple of reasons for that beyond simply world politics uh when I begin my class at Brown every fall in the history of American intervention I do point out some factors that shape world history that I think those of us in the business of analyzing history underestimate and one of them is to the private psychology of individuals I think this played a great deal into the role of the founding of the security state in the United States in this way during the World War two as you all know the US had an intelligence agency the OSS the Office of Strategic Services Allen Dulles was of course one of the leading figures of the OSS he headed the station in Switzerland ran operations all over Europe after the war was over they wanted to continue their operations in Europe in fact Allen Dulles had applied to become head of the OSS in all of Europe bill Donovan the head of it didn't think much of Allen Dulles administrative abilities so wouldn't give him that job but agreed to make him head of the OSS station in Berlin only a few days after Allen Dulles got there to take over this job President Harry Truman abolished the OSS and Allen Dulles had to go home he had to go back to work for his brothers law firm again which he didn't like all the other OSS officers had to go back home and go back home it's back to the investment bank back to the law firm back to Wall Street back to the people you went to Princeton with and you went to Choate with uh and they were happy they had been living at a rental and filled life right on the edge of excitement and death they were likely British pilots during the Battle of Britain who were going to be dead

[00:28:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1682s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1682s)

of Britain who were going to be dead from moment to moment and suddenly they're back delivering milk and Bristol people like Allen Dulles could not handle this transition they spent countless hours talking about how to get back in the business how can we get back to doing something like we used to do which was so much fun and we saved the world well one way to do it was to promote the idea that there was a threat out there just as great as the threat that was posed by Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan they heavily promoted that idea and Allen Dulles was then a co-author of the bill the National Security Act of 1947 that created the CIA as was referred to here already it was created in a very special way and it's like this is so important I need to repeat it it had always been the rule of Western intelligence services to separate intelligence gathering from covert action you don't want to have the two in the same agency otherwise every intelligence report logically ends with the conclusion so we need a covert operation Allen Dulles broke down that wall which was famously observed by the British Secret Service always thought to have been the gold standard in that business so Allen Dulles wrote a bill creating an agency the CIA that would do both it would do intelligence gathering but also act on intelligence of really a dramatic and fateful change Allen Dulles then maneuvered himself into the new CIA very quickly and brought a number of the old OSS men with him including his former deputy from Switzerland Richard Helms they moved into the CIA together and as you all know Allen Dulles then

[00:30:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1801s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1801s)

and as you all know Allen Dulles then became head of the CIA under Eisenhower in 1953 now Eisenhower had a very important role in the foundation of the situation that we're talking about right now it was not known at the time nor could it have been but Eisenhower was a fierce supporter of the idea of covert action he loved the idea of using the sea I a to overthrow foreign governments now he never explained why he's so strongly supported covert action because he never admitted that there was any in fact in his memoir he lies specifically and explicitly about what he knew and what he did he would have said I'm sure if we could bring him back now those aren't lies I was protecting national security so why what would he say if he could come back and be honest with us about why he supported these covert operations I think one thing you would have told us is that from his point of view covert action was a peace project don't forget Eisenhower had to spit send kids off to die by the thousands in World War two this must have weighed on him when Allen Dulles came to him with this idea I can overthrow a foreign government and get rid of your problem in country X for just a few dollars and hardly anyone will die it sounded great to Eisenhower he felt that he had saved lives on both sides so you guessed ly resolve a problem and you do it without excessive bloodshed now this was a great fantasy and I think this might have been the second thing that Eisenhower might tell us now what he would have said if he was being

[00:32:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1920s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=1920s)

he would have said if he was being honest when I started authorizing covert operations to overthrow governments in foreign countries this was a new project we never had to do this before in the old days when we wanted to overthrow a government we just landed the Marines we couldn't do that anymore because the Red Army was out there so we had this new technique of covert action and it had never been done before so I didn't understand what the long-term implications might be I thought you just do it and it's over now in the writing business we're always taught to avoid cliches but like and every business we do have some cliches that guide our unright ik one cliché writers often throw around is every story is these are happy or sad depending on where you end it what does this work for covert action let's take our first covert action in the Dulles Eisenhower era 1953 most ldec in Iran actually Eisenhower did not come into office with any anti Mossadegh feelings later he became a great promoter of covert action reprimanded Allen Dulles for saying that burning the Cuban sugar fields would work with Castro he wanted something more something bigger and Eisenhower went on to become the first and possibly only president to authorize the assassination of foreign leaders but in the early days he didn't come in with any feelings against most attack but the Dulles brothers did John Foster Dulles was a senior partner at Sullivan & Cromwell the law firm that represented most of the major American multinational corporations one of those corporations was the Schroder Bank which was the financial agent for the anglo-iranian oil company a longtime client of Sullivan & Cromwell and of course Dulles

[00:34:03 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2043s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2043s)

Sullivan & Cromwell and of course Dulles would have realized that if Mossadegh in Iran could get away with nationalizing his country's main resource other countries might want to nationalize their own resources and this could upset the whole way the world has run therefore John Foster Dulles was particularly eager to overthrow Mosaddegh Allen Dulles had his own motivation Allen Dulles his greatest success in his legal career was getting the Shah of Iran to sign on to what was then the largest development project in world history in which a court source ium of American engineering firms would come to Iran and completely transform the country a Mossadegh in his national front killed that project and Allen Dulles didn't forget that either so they came in with the desire to overthrow Mosaddegh and they persuaded Eisenhower to do it in fact we can now follow the process by which this coup was approved through the declassified documents there's only one moment when any member of the US government expresses any doubt and it's Eisenhower himself they're in a meeting of the National Security Council and Eisenhower said something like I'm glad we're getting rid of this communist Mossadegh but I didn't even know he was a communist and in fact Mossadegh was an elderly feudal landlord who despised all socialist ideas and John Foster Dulles had the great answer oh you're right he's not a communist but ah Iran is a big country it's right on the border of the Soviet Union it has a lot of oil Mossadegh is old he's thick he could die there's a Communist Party in Iran it's

too dangerous a situation to be allowed to continue in Eisenhower agreed went ahead and launched that operation as you all know from reading an interesting book about it it only took Kermit Roosevelt three weeks in the summer of 1953 to throw

[00:36:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2161s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2161s)

weeks in the summer of 1953 to throw Iran into complete chaos and organize a project by which Mossadegh was overthrown so if you could stop history right there it seemed like the perfect ending we got rid of a guy we didn't like most of all and we replaced him with a guy the Shah who would do whatever we wanted sounds like the perfect ending but history doesn't stop and you can trace that forward now to today the Shah that we placed back in power ruled with increasing repression for 25 years his repression produced the explosion of the late 1970s what we call the Islamic Revolution that brought to power a clique of fanatically anti-american mullahs who have spent decades working intently and sometimes quite violently to undermine American interests all over the world that revolution also emboldened Iran's enemy Saddam Hussein next door to invade Iran we were so angry at Iran for overthrowing our Shah and the hostage crisis that we embraced Saddam we provided him with help in his Persian Gulf war that was the beginning of our spiral down into the Iraq disaster we're still in that Revolution of 1979 also terrified the Soviets who thought that radical Islam would now be penetrating through their southern border that was one of the motivations that led them to invade Afghanistan that's what brought us into our death cycle in Afghanistan from which we're still not able to extract ourselves and our confrontation with Iran continues to be a major part of our foreign policy so a lot of history unfolded from three weeks in the summer of 1953 Allen Dulles and Eisenhower followed this path relentlessly through the 1950s the very next year after overthrowing Mossadegh their next target was our bends in Guatemala who had the temerity to

[00:38:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2280s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2280s)

Guatemala who had the temerity to propose a land reform law that affected the interests of United Fruit Company one of the oldest and most faithful clients of Sullivan and Cromwell the Dulles brothers had personally been in Guatemala working for the United Fruit Company and arranging its contracts with past dictators so they wanted to get rid of him for those reasons that stem directly from that so why do we carry out these operations what is the motivation is it really strategic that we feel we're under threat from a foreign enemy or is it economic is it business the more I try to parse this the more I realize the two of them go very closely together so we look at somebody like Arbenz or Mossadegh or later on Sukarno Lumumba so many other third world leaders and we say these people are not so are not on board with our foreign policy particularly they're bothering American companies it always starts with that there's some corporation that has a problem with the local government this corporation then goes to the US government and ask for help it's there that the motivation changes the US government does not intervene in order to protect the rights of corporations they convince themselves or let's put it ourselves we as the US we convince ourselves that the only reason the government of country X would be bothering an American company like trying to nationalize resources or trying to impose a labor code would be that they are strategically anti-american they're in league with our enemies that's the reason we want to overthrow them not because they're bothering the companies it's because they're against us geopolitically how do we know they're against us geopolitically because they're bothering American companies so the motivation morphs a little bit but remains essentially the same now this policy of intervention reached a peak under

[00:40:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2401s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2401s)

intervention reached a peak under Eisenhower with the two orders to assassinate Castro and assassinate Lumumba far as we know these are the only two orders that came from a President to assassinate foreign leaders the Church Committee later came up with a great word to describe how Eisenhower ordered these assassinations I don't know if this one would get through your spellcheck he ordered them circumlocution Snee I want that guy sawed off it's pretty circumlocution so we carried out these assassination projects as ways to promote the same regime change operations that we've been involved with all over the world all of

these are motivated by the idea that our sphere of influence includes the whole world a James Bond was a great influence on Allen Dulles and on President Kennedy unfortunately I think one of the great long lessons that James Bond teaches us is that one guy can go out and solve a big world problem and there's never any repercussions you close the book in the story's over I think Kennedy may have fantasized this himself don't forget Kennedy was also the guy who increased our troop strength in Vietnam from 800 to 16,000 he was the person who named the chief law enforcement officer of the United States Robert Kennedy to coordinator process to assassinate leaders in foreign countries all of this has led us to the belief we have today that we must be involved in every conflict in the world and that we're good at it will improve things there doesn't seem to be any limit to the number of times these operations can go wrong before we question whether they

00:42:01 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5ZboVkyHpM&t=2521s>)

wrong before we question whether they are wise or not now I mentioned that when I was writing my book about that first debate back in 1898 I made this discovery that the debate ever happened and also a little bit about Mark Twain as often happens when you're embarked in projects like this you make other discoveries I discovered a great American who I had known something about but not much William Graham Sumner he's in one of the books you've just been given he wrote a wonderful essay which is in that book called the conquest of the United States by Spain in which he argues we defeated them militarily but they defeated us by forcing us to adopt their oppressive colonial mentality William Graham Sumner was the founder of sociology as a discipline not incidentally he's the inventor of the term ethnocentrism so I just want to close by reading you a speech that he made in 1898 and ask you to reflect on its relevance the great foe of democracy now and in the near future is plutocracy every year that passes brings out this antagonism more distinctly it is to be the social war of the 20th century in that war militarism expansion and imperialism will all favor plutocracy therefore expansion and imperialism are a grand onslaught on democracy you [Music]

END